

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 102(b) as being anticipated by Peng U.S. Patent No. 5,594,675 ("Peng"). Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Washakowski et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0238117 ("Washakowski"). Claims 16-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Washakowski in view of Peng.

Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 in order to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally-filed specification.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

Statement Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(3)

Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments presented herein be entered under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(3). Applicant believes that the proposed amendments place this application in condition for allowance. Applicant has made these amendments in compliance with the Examiner's suggestion for overcoming the prior art (see, e.g., Office Action, page 13). These amendments were not presented earlier because applicant believed that their previous reply was a good faith

effort to advance the prosecution of this application and that the amendments and arguments presented at that time were sufficient to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant believes that that constitutes "good and sufficient cause why the [present] amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented."

Summary of Telephonic Interview

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the July 19, 2007 interview with the undersigned. During the interview applicant proposed amending the claims to overcome the rejections of claims 1-21. The Examiner acknowledged that the proposed amendments to claims 1 and 15 would overcome the rejections over the prior art of record. Applicant agreed to amend the claims to incorporate the features of the proposed amendments to claims 1 and 15 that the Examiner acknowledged to be allowable over the of-record prior art.

Reply to the Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-21

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Peng. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant's invention, as defined by amended independent claims 1 and 15, is directed to DSP circuitry that independently processes a plurality of multi-channel data signals. The circuitry includes, inter alia, interconnection

circuitry that allows a value at the input of each column to be selectively routed to any register in the column by bypassing any register or registers that precede the register in the respective column.

Peng generally describes a digital FIR filter. FIG. 11 shows multiple selector circuits 735 each including a shift register 734-u for storing L tap coefficient values and a multiplexer 732-u connected to each shift register. The multiplexer can select either the tap coefficient value outputted from its own shift register or the value outputted from a previous selector circuit 735 via line 736. (Peng, FIG. 11, col. 17, lines 5-24.)

Applicant respectfully submits that Peng does not show or suggest interconnection circuitry that selectively routes a value to any register in the column by bypassing any register or registers that precede the register in the column, as defined by claims 1 and 15. In the Peng device, each selector circuit includes only one multiplexer 732 for selecting, as input to the shift register, either the tap coefficient value outputted from its own shift register or the one outputted from a previous selector circuit. Nowhere does Peng show or suggest that multiplexer 732 can selectively route the input value to any register in the selector circuit by bypassing any register or registers that precede the register in the circuit. Thus, Peng does not show or suggest show all the features of applicant's claims 1 and 15.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 15 and claims 2-14 and 16-21 that

depend, directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 15, are allowable over Peng.

Claims 15-21

The Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Washakowski. The Examiner rejected claims 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Washakowski in view of Peng. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Washakowski generally describes a baseband shaping device. The baseband shaping device includes a tapped delay line 202I with a plurality of delay elements 203 coupled to an in-phase data bit stream. Each stage is coupled to a corresponding tap 205 of the delay line 202I. Eight individual registers 442Ia-g coupled in series represent the eight taps of the delay line in the filter. (Washakowski, FIGS. 2A and 4C; and page 2, paragraph 23 and page 4, paragraph 39.)

Applicant respectfully submits that Washakowski does not show or suggest tap delay line circuitry that includes interconnection circuitry that allows a value received at the input to be selectively routed to any register of the registers in the tap delay line circuitry by bypassing any register or registers that precede the register in the circuitry, as defined by claim 15. In the Washakowski device, the tap delay line circuitry includes registers coupled in series, where each register is only coupled to receive the value of its respective tap in the bit stream. Nowhere does Washakowski show or suggest interconnection circuitry that allows selectively

routing a value to any register of the registers by bypassing any register or registers that precede the register in the circuitry. Thus, Washakowski does not show or suggest all the features of applicant's claim 15.

Peng, cited as allegedly showing features of applicant's dependent claims, does not make up for the deficiencies in Washakowski relative to the rejection.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 and claims 16-21 that depend, directly or indirectly therefrom, are allowable over Washakowski and Peng.

Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 1-21 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gall C. Gotfried/

Gall C. Gotfried

Registration No. 58,333

Agent for Applicant

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP

ROPES & GRAY LLP

Customer No. 36981

1211 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8704

Tel: (212) 596-9000